

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/656,491	09/05/2003	Dagmar Beyerlein	5618.P3653	8370	
7590 06/17/2009 James C. Scheller			EXAM	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			WITCZAK, O	WITCZAK, CATHERINE	
Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Los Angeles, CA 90025			3767		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/17/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/656,491 BEYERLEIN, DAGMAR Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit CATHERINE N. WITCZAK 3767 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2009. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-3.5-12 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 21-25 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued

examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the

finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

submission filed on 6/10/2009 has been entered.

Claim Objections

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original

numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the

remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered

consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously

presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered (newly added) claim 24 been renumbered as claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Application/Control Number: 10/656,491

Art Unit: 3767

 Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11, 12 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gambale et al (US 6.248.112).

Gambale et al disclose in Figures 3F, 9A-C and column 7, line 44- column 8, line 5 a device comprising a fluid source (110) and a needle (22) with first and second openings which open to the same lumen of the needle and are located apart at a predetermined distance, and a pressure sensor connected to the needle configured to measure no significant change in pressure as compared to a first pressure, a second pressure that is a significant increase in pressure as compared to the first pressure when the needle contacts tissue and the first opening becomes occluded, and a third pressure that is a significant increase in pressure as compared to the second pressure when the needle penetrates the tissues and the second opening becomes occluded; wherein readings from the detector are sent to a pressure detector (31) and displayed on an electronic readout.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 5, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gambale et al.

Gambale et al discloses the claimed invention except for expressly disclosing the size of the aperture, distance of the aperture from the end of the needle, and outer/inner diameter of the syringe. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change the are, distance, and diameters because Applicant has not disclosed that these values provide an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of

Art Unit: 3767

ordinary skill in the art would have been able to change these values in order to control the amount of flow and location of outflow as desired. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Gambale et al to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 7, 9, and 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignces. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Longi, The F. Longi, The F. Logi, Th

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-3, 4-12 and 21-25 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 7,364,567. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim similar subject matter drawn to detecting tissue contact and penetration depth of a needle.

Art Unit: 3767

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of

the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to CATHERINE N. WITCZAK whose telephone number is (571)272-7179. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin

Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Catherine N Witczak/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767

/Kevin C. Sirmons/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767